

REMARKS

Reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated January 3, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-22, 25, and 27-31, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Dahm (U.S. Patent Pub. No.2001/0014615) in view of Boltz (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,055); and rejected claims 12 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Dahm in view of Boltz and Oh (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,458).

By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 13, 25, and 31 have been amended to provide a clearer presentation of the claimed subject matter. Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced (see, at least paragraphs 46-47 and 62-63). As such, claims 1-7, 9-23, 25, and 27-31 are presented for examination of which claims 1, 13, 25, and 31 are independent.

Applicants respectfully traverse the prior art rejections, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), for the reasons presented below.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

As indicated above, independent claim 1 positively recites, *inter alia*, the features: at least one *bearer network in functional connection with the serving network*; creating at least one database comprising subscriber data, from which there is *functional connection to the bearer network*, said subscriber data being *similar to the data stored in a subscriber application comprised by the terminal, the subscriber data including authentication information*; automatically transmitting, from the subscriber database, subscriber data ... in response to the terminal having the right to use said subscriber database *and in response to acceptable authentication of the subscriber database in the bearer network*; and *providing the terminal with communication services according to at least said transmitted subscriber data*.

As depicted in Figure 1 of Dahm, an airnet 102 serving terminal 106 is provided (i.e., serving network). Element 108 of Dahm refers to an antenna, wherein terminal 106 communicates wirelessly with the antenna 108 via airnet 102. There is no mention, whatsoever, of at least one *bearer network*, much less, the bearer network in functional connection with the airnet 102. Thus, Dahm fails to teach or suggest, at least one *bearer network in functional connection with the serving network*, as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

It appears that the Examiner is equating Dahm's user account hosted by a server to Applicants' subscriber database. Assuming arguendo, that Dahm's alleged user account is the same as Applicants' subscriber database (though Applicants do not concede this); Dahm's user account does not have a functional connection to the bearer network. In fact, as mentioned above, since Dahm fails to disclose a bearer network, it is impossible for the user account to have a functional connection to the bearer network. In contrast, per various embodiments of Applicants invention, and as depicted in as-filed Figure 3 for example, there is a functional connection between subscriber database and bearer network. Thus, Dahm fails to teach or suggest *a functional connection between a subscriber database and a bearer network*, as required by Applicants' claim 1.

Moreover, there is no mention that Dahm's user account hosted by the server has subscriber data that is similar to the data stored in a subscriber application comprised by terminal 106. Furthermore, Dahm fails to teach or suggest that the user account includes authentication information. As such, Dahm fails to teach or suggest, subscriber data in subscriber database being *similar to the data stored in a subscriber application comprised by the terminal, the subscriber data including authentication information*, as required by Applicants' claim 1.

Furthermore, there is no mention in Dahm, of transmitting subscriber data to terminal 106 in response to acceptable authentication of Dahm's user account (which appears to be equated to Applicants' subscriber database). As such, Dahm fails to teach or suggest, automatically transmitting, from the subscriber database, subscriber data ... in response to the terminal having the right to use said subscriber database *and in response to acceptable*

authentication of the subscriber database in the bearer network, as required by Applicants' claim 1.

Moreover, Dahm merely discloses providing mobile subscribers with access to account services, however, fails to teach or suggest the provision of communication services. Thus, Dahm fails to teach or suggest, *providing the terminal with communication services according to at least said transmitted subscriber data*, as required by Applicants' claim 1.

The remaining references, Boltz and Oh, are incapable of curing the deficiencies of Dahm identified above. Particularly, Boltz appears to disclose storing supplementary data in the SS database 60, however, fails to teach or suggest, storing of authentication information in or authentication of the SS database. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that none of the asserted references, whether taken alone or in reasonable combination, teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements recited by amended claim 1. As such, claim 1 is clearly patentable. And, because claims 2-7, and 9-12 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, claims 2-7, and 9-12 are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations. Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the prior art rejections of claims 1-7, and 9-12 is respectfully requested.

With regard to the remaining claims, independent claims 13, 25, and 31 recite similar patentable features as claim 1, so claims 13, 25, and 31 are also patentable for the reasons presented relative to claim 1. And, because claims 14-23, and 27-30 depend from claims 13 and 25, respectively, claims 14-23, and 27-30 are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations. Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the prior art rejections of claims 13-23, 25, and 27-31 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All matters having been addressed and in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants' representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP
SHAW PITTMAN LLP

By: 

E. R. HERNANDEZ
Reg. No. 47641
Tel. No. 703.770.7788
Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: March 19, 2008
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900